| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary** | 10/743,533 | MURATANI, HIROFUMI |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | ANTHONY MACKOWEY | 2624 | |

**All Participants:**                                                    **Status of Application:** _____

   (1) *ANTHONY MACKOWEY*.                              (3) _____.

   (2) *Richard Burgujian (Reg. No. 31,744)*.          (4) _____.

**Date of Interview:** *30 July 2009*                      **Time:** *2:35 pm*

**Type of Interview:**
   ☒ Telephonic
   ☐ Video Conference
   ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:   ☐ Yes   ☐ No
   If Yes, provide a brief description:    .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:


Claims discussed:
*1 and 10*


Prior art documents discussed:


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


/Brian P. Werner/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

                           (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's representative indicating claims 1 and 10 had been amended to the "acquisition unit including input terminals" and while the disclosure supported the acquisition units and acquisition of the topological invareiant, key information and target content, the disclosure did not provide sufficient support for strucutre corresponding to "input terminals". Examiner noted that the "terminals" appeared to have been added to the claim to provide additional or clarification to the structure of the apparatus in order to overcome the previous rejection under 35 USC 101. Examiner also indicated that upon further review and consideration of the specification, particularly page 45, the specification did not support the "units" as being embodied by pure software but were a combination of a computer and software program, where the computer is functioning according to the software instructions thereby realizing the function of the "units". It was agreed to delete the language "including input terminals" from claims 1 and 10 through Examiner's Amendment.